



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/731,805

12/08/2003

Christoph Bussler

021756-002600US

5730

51206

7590

09/04/2008

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
8TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

SYED, FARHAN M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2165

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/04/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/731,805	Applicant(s) BUSSLER ET AL.	
	Examiner FARHAN M. SYED	Art Unit 2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-26 are pending. The Examiner acknowledges the amendment made to claims 1, 17, and 19. No claims were cancelled.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 01 July 2008 has been entered.

Response to Remarks/Argument

3. Applicant's arguments filed 01 July 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the reasons set forth below.

Applicant argues:

(1) Drake, Rasmussen, and Sang do not teach or suggest 'wherein applying the determined validation rules results in one of partially and completely validating the metadata for the object model, a partial validating of the model allowing an existing portion of the metadata to be validated before all metadata for the object model is determined, wherein applying the determined validation rules occurs prior to

Art Unit: 2165

deployment of the object model, a deployment of the object model allowing the object model to be used to store data according to the object model.”

The Examiner disagrees and has addressed the arguments in the rejection below.

(2) “Combining Rasmussen with Drake, even if there were motivation to do so, would still not render obvious Applicants’ claim 1.”

The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Drake teaches data validation in a data model that is expressed using markup language notation, in which metadata is an instance of. Rasmussen teaches transforming metadata model that contains model objects. Therefore, the motivation would have been to provide multiple users access to the validation application of Drake (See Rasmussen col. 3 lines 37-41).

(3) “Combining Rasmussen with Drake and Sang, even if there were motivation to do so, would still not render obvious Applicants’ claim 1.”

The Examiner disagrees for reasons similar to arguments addressed in (2).

(4) “Claims 2, 4, 18, and 20-21 are not rendered obvious by Drake, Rasmussen and Sang in further view of Mikhailov.”

The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Drake teaches data validation in a data model that is expressed using markup language notation, in which metadata is an instance of. Rasmussen teaches transforming metadata model that contains model objects. Sang teaches validating and updating parts of XML document (in which metadata is found) and updating the document in the database (i.e. data model). Mikhailov teaches creating a database schema (i.e. data model) corresponding to a receive form, publish the form for data submissions, record the data submissions in a database table or other database structure, and produce reports based on the data stored in the table. Therefore, the motivation would have been to provide multiple users access to the validation application of Drake (**See Ramussen col. 3 lines 37-41**) with the convenience of structured online communication as taught by *Mikhailov* (**See col. 1 lines 27-31**).

(5) Claims 7-13, 16, and 22-24 are not rendered obvious over Drake, Rasmussen and Sang in further view of Lindberg.”

The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Drake teaches data validation in a data model that is expressed using markup language notation, in which metadata is an instance of. Rasmussen teaches transforming metadata model that contains model objects. Sang teaches validating and updating parts of XML document (in which metadata is found) and updating the document in the database (i.e. data model). Lindberg teaches a relational tree that contains plurality of entities in a mark up language (such as XML) to the business object model layer and processes the entities in the mark up language. herefore, the motivation would have been to provide a more useful way of organizing and labeling the data without changing the information model layer (**Lindberg paragraph [0016]**) and thereby allowing for easily and efficiently sharing the data and data validation among multiple presentations (**Drake paragraph [0022]**).

Hence, the Applicant's arguments do not distinguish over the claimed invention over the prior art of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2165

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 14, 15, 17, 19, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drake et al. (US Pub. No. 2003/0070142 A1)(previously presented), hereinafter *Drake*, in view of Rasmussen (USPN 7,185,016 B1) (previously presented), hereinafter *Rasmussen*, and further in view of Sang-Kyun et al. ("Immediate and Partial Validation Mechanism for the Conflict Resolution of Update Operations in XML Databases." 2002) (previously presented), hereinafter Sang.

Per claim 1, *Drake* discloses a computer-implemented method of validating data in an object model (**See Title teaches validation of data model object content. Also see paragraph [0024].**), comprising:

identifying a first subject of validation wherein the first subject is one of an object, an attribute, an association and a collection of objects (**Fig. 3 illustrates identifying a first subject of validation as social security number where the name attribute identifies "social_security_number". Further see paragraphs [0024-0025 and 0029]**);

determining a context of data validation based on the first subject, the context including one of a) the first subject, and b) the first subject and one or more additional subjects (**See Fig. 3 and see paragraphs [0024-0025] wherein designing rules**

specifically for social security numbers is determining a context of data validation based on the first subject.);

determining one or more validation rules for each subject in the context **(See Fig. 3 and paragraphs [0011, 0020, and 0024-0025] where determining rules for the subject in the context is taught.);** and

applying the determined validation rules to each subject in the context, **(See Figs. 3 and 4, also paragraphs [0011, 0024-0025, and 0031] teaches applying validation rules where partial or complete validation will occur.).**

Drake does not explicitly disclose the data is metadata in an object model stored in a database. However, *Ramussen* discloses metadata models and that the metadata is stored in data sources such as databases **(See col. 12 lines 53-55, and col. 2 lines 26-27).**

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of data object models to allow users of the system of *Ramussen* including a database storing metadata to run the validation application of *Drake* **(See col. 12 lines 53-55, and col. 2 lines 26-27).** The motivation would have been to provide multiple users access to the validation application of *Drake* **(See *Ramussen* col. 3 lines 37-41).**

Drake, in view of *Ramussen*, does not explicitly disclose wherein applying the determined validation rules results in one of partially and completely validating the

Art Unit: 2165

metadata for the object model and wherein applying the determined validation rules occurs prior to deployment of the object model, a deployment of the object model allowing the object model to be used to store data according to the object model.

However, Sang discloses partial or full, i.e. complete, validation **(See Abstract of page 387 -1st page-, also page 393-394 where partial or complete validation occurs.)** and wherein applying the determined validation rules **(i.e. validation mechanism)(page 389)** occurs prior to deployment of the object model **(i.e. “Before we store or update XML documents in applications, we must verify that their structural information is valid...” “Most of XML database systems use deferred and full validation methods when XML documents are updated.)(page 389)**, a deployment of the object model allowing the object model to be used to store data according to the object model **(i.e. “We construct and store a DFA per each element declaration in DTD files.” “The extracted DTD information is stored in the database for validating update operations...”)(page 389).**

Both Drake, in view of Ramussen, and Sang are directed to object validation in the art of database technology. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the cited references because Sang would have provide for performance improvement **as seen in Abstract and pages 393-394 – see "4 Performance Evaluation" through "4.3 Analysis of Performance".**

Art Unit: 2165

Per claim 3, *Drake* discloses the method of claim 1, wherein identifying includes receiving an indication from a user interface module, said indication identifying the first subject (**Fig. 1 illustrates graphical user interface interaction. See paragraphs [0031]).**

Per claim 5, *Drake* discloses the method of claim 1, wherein identifying includes receiving an update indication identifying the first subject in response to a modification of the first subject (**See paragraph [0032] teaches update indication.**).

Per claim 6, *Drake* discloses the method of claim 1, wherein each of the one or more validation rules is one of a correctness type rule and a completeness type rule, a correctness validation rule operable to be applied while partially validating the object model and a completeness validation rule operable to be applied while completely validating the object model (**See Fig. 3 and paragraphs [0004 and 0025] where validation is for correctness and/or completeness validation.**).

Per claim 14, *Drake* discloses the method of claim 1, wherein determining one or more validation rules includes identifying rules in rule files based on the subject type of each subject to be validated (**See rule file in Fig. 3).**

Art Unit: 2165

Per claim 15, *Drake* discloses the method of claim 14, wherein each rule file is a Java file **(See paragraph [0035] where software packages is JavaBeans implying Java files)**.

Per claim 17, *Drake* discloses a data validation system for validating an object model, comprising:

means for identifying a first subject of validation, wherein the first subject type is one of an object, an attribute, an association and a collection of objects **(Fig. 3 illustrates identifying a first subject of validation as social security number where the name attribute identifies “social_security_number”. Further see paragraphs [0024-0025 and 0029])**;

means for determining a context of data validation based on the first subject, the context including one of a) the first subject, and b) the first subject and one or more additional subjects **(See Fig. 3 and see paragraphs [0024-0025] wherein designing rules specifically for social security numbers is determining a context of data validation based on the first subject.)**;

means for determining one or more validation rules for each subject in the context **(See Fig. 3 and paragraphs [0011, 0020, and 0024-0025] where determining rules for the subject in the context is taught.)**; and

means for applying the determined validation rules to each subject in the context **(See Figs. 3 and 4, also paragraphs [0011, 0024-0025, and 0031] teaches applying validation rules.)**.

Drake does not explicitly disclose the data is metadata nor a database that stores the objects and metadata of the object model. However, *Ramussen* discloses metadata models and that the metadata is stored in data sources such as databases (**See col. 12 lines 53-55, and col. 2 lines 26-27**).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of data object models to allow users of the system of *Ramussen* including a database storing metadata to run the validation application of *Drake* (**See col. 12 lines 53-55, and col. 2 lines 26-27**). The motivation would have been to provide multiple users access to the validation application of *Drake* (**See *Ramussen* col. 3 lines 37-41**).

Drake, in view of *Ramussen*, does not explicitly disclose wherein the means for applying the determined validation rules provides for both partially and completely validating the metadata for the object model. However, *Sang* discloses partial or full, i.e. complete, validation (**See Abstract of page 387 -1st page-, also page 393-394 where partial or complete validation occurs.**) and wherein applying the determined validation rules (**i.e. validation mechanism**)(**page 389**) occurs prior to deployment of the object model (**i.e. “Before we store or update XML documents in applications, we must verify that their structural information is valid...” “Most of XML database systems use deferred and full validation methods when XML documents are updated.”**)(**page 389**), a deployment of the object model allowing the object model to be used to store data according to the object model (**i.e. “We construct and store a DFA**

Art Unit: 2165

per each element declaration in DTD files.” “The extracted DTD information is stored in the database for validating update operations...”)(page 389).

Both Drake, in view of Ramussen, and Sang are directed to object validation in the art of database technology. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the cited references because Sang would have provide for performance improvement **as seen in Abstract and pages 393-394 – see "4 Performance Evaluation" through "4.3 Analysis of Performance"**.

Per claim 19, *Drake* discloses a method of validating data in an object model, the method comprising:

receiving user defined rules, each rule defining a validation rule on a data object **(See Fig. 4 illustrates and paragraph 0031 teaches custom validation is user validation. See paragraphs [0011 and 0020] teaches receiving user defined rules. See Title and paragraph [0024 teaches validation rule on data model object content.)**, each rule being one of a completeness type rule and a correctness type rule **(Fig. 3 illustrates and paragraphs [0005 and 0025] disclose completeness and correctness type rules.);**

storing the validation rules **(See Fig. 1 illustrates stored validation rules in data model.);**

identifying a first subject of metadata validation, wherein the first subject has a subject type selected from the group consisting of is one of an attribute, an association, an object and a collection of objects (**Fig. 3 illustrates identifying a first subject of validation as social security number where the name attribute identifies “social_security_number”. Further see paragraphs [0024-0025 and 0028-0029].**);

determining a context of validation based on the first subject, wherein the context includes the first subject and none, one or more additional subjects (**See Fig. 3 and see paragraphs [0024-0025] wherein designing rules specifically for social security numbers is determining a context of data validation based on the first subject.**); and

applying a correctness type validation rule to each of the first and additional subjects (**See Figs. 3 and 4, also paragraphs [0011, 0024-0025, and 0031] teaches applying validation rules. See Fig. 3 and paragraphs [0004] where validation is for correctness.**); and

applying a correctness type and completeness type validation rule to each of the determined first and additional subjects (**See Fig. 3 and paragraphs [0004 and 0025] where Drake teaches validation for correctness and completeness.**)

Drake does not explicitly disclose the data is metadata nor a database that stores the objects and metadata of the object model. However, *Ramussen* discloses metadata models and that the metadata is stored in data sources such as databases (**See col. 12 lines 53-55, and col. 2 lines 26-27**).

Drake does not explicitly disclose storing the validation rules to the database. However, *Drake* teaches storing validation rules in the data model (**See Fig. 1-2 and paragraph [0019]**), while *Ramussen* discloses storing the data model in a database (**See col. 12 lines 53-55, and col. 2 lines 26-27**).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of data object models to allow users of the system of *Ramussen* including a database storing metadata to run the validation application of *Drake* (**See col. 12 lines 53-55, and col. 2 lines 26-27**). The motivation would have been to provide multiple users access to the validation application of *Drake* (**See *Ramussen* col. 3 lines 37-41**).

Drake, in view of *Ramussen*, does not explicitly disclose wherein applying the determined validation rules for correctness when only a portion of the metadata is determined; and apply for correctness and completeness when all of the metadata is determined. However, *Sang* discloses partial or full, i.e. complete, validation (**See Abstract of page 387 -1st page-, also page 393-394 where partial or complete validation occurs.**) and wherein applying the determined validation rules (**i.e. validation mechanism**)(**page 389**) occurs prior to deployment of the object model (**i.e. “Before we store or update XML documents in applications, we must verify that their structural information is valid...” “Most of XML database systems use deferred and full validation methods when XML documents are updated.**)(**page 389**), a deployment of the object model allowing the object model to be used to store

Art Unit: 2165

data according to the object model (i.e. **“We construct and store a DFA per each element declaration in DTD files.” “The extracted DTD information is stored in the database for validating update operations...”**)(page 389).

Both Drake, in view of Ramussen, and Sang are directed to object validation in the art of database technology. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the cited references because Sang would have provide for performance improvement **as seen in Abstract and pages 393-394 – see “4 Performance Evaluation” through “4.3 Analysis of Performance”**.

Per claim(s) 25, rejection of claims 14 and 19 are fully incorporated.

Claim 25 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 14 due to the similarity in scope in the limitations of the claims. **(See respective claims above.)**

Per claim(s) 26, rejection of claims 15, 19 are fully incorporated. Claim26 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 15 and 19 due to the similarity in scope in the limitations of the claims. **(See respective claims above.)**

6. Claims 2, 4, 18, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drake et al. (US Pub. No. 2003/0070142 A1) (previously presented), hereinafter *Drake*, in view of Rasmussen (USPN 7,185,016 B1) (previously presented),

Art Unit: 2165

hereinafter *Rasmussen*, in view of Sang-Kyun et al. ("Immediate and Partial Validation Mechanism for the Conflict Resolution of Update Operations in XML Databases." 2002) (previously presented), hereinafter Sang, and in further view of Mikhailov et al. (USPN 6,968,500 B2) (previously presented), hereinafter *Mikhailov*.

Per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Furthermore, *Drake* as modified by *Rasmussen* does not explicitly disclose the method of claim 1, wherein each subject is a metadata object selected from the group consisting of a MetaAttribute, a MetaAssociation, a MetaAssociationEnd, a MetaClass and a MetaCollection. However, *Mikhailov* discloses a group of types of metadata associated with the corresponding database table **(See col. 5 lines 39-54, col. 14 lines 62-64, and col. 1 lines 1-31.)**

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of data object models to allow users of the application and system of *Drake* and *Rasmussen* to utilize the group of types of metadata associated by *Mikhailov* **(See col. 5 lines 39-54, col. 14 lines 62-64, and col. 1 lines 1-31.)**. The motivation would have been to provide multiple users access to the validation application of Drake **(See *Rasmussen* col. 3 lines 37-41)** with the convenience of structured online communication as taught by *Mikhailov* **(See col. 1 lines 27-31)**.

Per claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Furthermore, *Drake* and *Rasmussen* do not explicitly disclose the method of claim 1, wherein identifying includes receiving an indication from a configuration management module, said indication

Art Unit: 2165

identifying the first subject. However, *Mikhailov* discloses automation forms handling application service (**See col. 5 lines 19-38.**).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of data object models to allow users of the application and system of *Drake* and *Rasmussen* to utilize the group of types of metadata associated by *Mikhailov* (**See col. 5 lines 39-54, col. 14 lines 62-64, and col. 1 lines 1-31.**). The motivation would have been to provide multiple users access to the validation application of *Drake* (**See *Rasmussen* col. 3 lines 37-41**) with the convenience of structured online communication as taught by *Mikhailov* (**See col. 1 lines 27-31**).

Per claim(s) 18 and 20, rejection of claims 2, 17, and 19 are fully incorporated. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under the same rationale as claim 2 due to the similarity in scope in the limitations of the claims. (**See respective claims above.**).

Per claim(s) 21, rejection of claims 3, 4, and 19 are fully incorporated.

Claim 21 is rejected under the same rationale as claims 3 and 4 due to the similarity in scope in the limitations of the claims. (**See respective claims above.**).

7. Claims 7-13, 16, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Drake et al.* (US Pub. No. 2003/0070142 A1) (previously presented), hereinafter *Drake*, in view of *Rasmussen* (USPN 7,185,016 B1) (previously presented), hereinafter *Rasmussen*, in view of Sang-Kyun et al. ("Immediate and Partial Validation

Art Unit: 2165

Mechanism for the Conflict Resolution of Update Operations in XML Databases.” 2002) (previously presented), hereinafter Sang, and in further view of Lindberg et al. (US Pub. No. 2003/0028540 A1) (previously presented), hereinafter *Lindberg*.

Per claim 7, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Furthermore, *Drake* as modified by *Rasmussen* does not explicitly disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the first subject is a root object for a collection of associated objects. However, *Lindberg* discloses a first subject as a root object for a collection of associated objects (**See Fig. 2 shows “Person” as the root. Also see paragraph [0016]**).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of data object models to allow users of the application and system of *Drake* and *Rasmussen* where social security number is the subject to utilize the method of associating objects as taught by *Lindberg* (**See Fig. 2.**), whereby the person could be associated with other objects by its social security number attribute. The motivation would have been to provide a more useful way of organizing and labeling the data without changing the information model layer (***Lindberg* paragraph [0016]**) and thereby allowing for easily and efficiently sharing the data and data validation among multiple presentations (***Drake* paragraph [0022]**).

Per claims 8, the rejection of claim 7 is incorporated. *Drake*, *Rasmussen*, and *Lindberg* discloses wherein the collection of objects is a deployable collection including all objects

Art Unit: 2165

transitively associated with the root object (**See paragraph [0021] of Drake.**) and (**See Fig. 2 of Lindberg**).

Per claim 9, the rejection of claim 7 is incorporated. *Drake in view of Rasmussen and Lindberg* discloses wherein the collection of objects is an aggregated collection including the root object and all of its strongly aggregated child objects recursively (**See Fig. 2 of Lindberg**).

Per claim 10, the rejection of claims 1 and 7 are incorporated, wherein determining a context includes:

a) traversing all associations with a root object to identify target objects (**See Fig. 2 of Lindberg**);

b) repeating a) for each target object, with each target object as the root object (**See Fig. 2 of Lindberg**); and

c) generating a list of all target objects, wherein said list of objects represents a transitive closure based on the root object (**See paragraph [0021] of Drake and See Fig. 2 of Lindberg**).

1. **Per claim 11**, *Drake in view of Rasmussen and Lindberg* discloses the method of claim 10, wherein determining a context is implemented using queries written in the Java language or a meta-language (METALANG) or both (**See Java taught in paragraph [0035] of Drake.**).

Per claim 12, *Drake in view of Rasmussen and Lindberg* discloses the method of claim 10, wherein the list of objects forms the context for validation **(See Fig. 2 of Lindberg and paragraph [0016])**.

Per claims 13 and 22, rejection of claims 7, 10, and 19 are fully incorporated. Claims 13 and 22 are rejected under the same rationale as claim 7 due to the similarity in scope in the limitations of the claims. **(See respective claims above.)**

Per claim 16, the rejection of claims 1 and 7 are incorporated. Further, *Drake in view of Rasmussen and Lindberg* discloses the method of claim 1, wherein each subject in the context is one of an instance of an object, an instance of an object containing an attribute, an instance of an object having an association and an instance of root object of a deployable unit of a collection of objects **(See rejection of claims 1 and 7 above)**.

Per claim 23, rejection of claims 8, 9, and 22 are fully incorporated.

Claim 23 is rejected under the same rationale as claims 8 and 9 due to the similarity in scope in the limitations of the claims. **(See respective claims above.)**

Per claim 24, rejection of claims 10 and 22 are fully incorporated.

Art Unit: 2165

Claim 24 is rejected under the same rationale as claims 10 due to the similarity in scope in the limitations of the claims. **(See respective claims above.)**

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Farhan M. Syed whose telephone number is 571-272-7191. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christian Chace can be reached on 571-272-4190. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/F. M. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 2165

/Christian P. Chace/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165

Application/Control Number: 10/731,805
Art Unit: 2165

Page 22